REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pending claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-15, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,852 (Poulsen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,937,194 (Sundaresan). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With regard to claim 1, neither reference teaches or suggests translating a first program unit into two different other program units in the manner recited by claim 1. That is, claim 1 recites translating a first program unit into a second program unit and also translating that same first program unit into a third program unit, where the second and third program units are to perform different recited functions.

Neither Poulsen nor Sundaresan teaches or suggests translating a program unit into two different program units to perform different functions, and certainly not the functions recited in the claim. In this regard, the Office Action relies on Poulsen for teaching translation of a first program unit into multiple different program units. However, the program units contended to be the translated units in Poulsen are: "library calls (i.e., a second program unit") that reference privatizable storage object declarations (i.e., "a third program unit")." Office Action, p. 3.

Note that with regard to the contended third program unit, i.e., privatizable storage object declarations, these program statements are just that, declarations of storage objects, and are not an encapsulation of a reduction operation (as conceded by the Office Action). Nor do such declarations of Poulsen anywhere teach or suggest performing an algebraic operation on a set of variables. Instead, all the Office Action contends is that these privatizable storage object declarations encapsulate a global storage object. Such a global storage object however nowhere teaches or suggests either a reduction operation or performance of an algebraic operation.

As such, the Office Action seeks to combine Sundaresan with Poulsen. However, Sundaresan nowhere discusses program translation or any reason why its program would need to be translated in the manner taught by Poulsen. Simply put, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references in order to combine them to obtain the claimed subject matter. In this regard, the Office Action merely states that it would have been obvious to combine the references "for the purpose of improving the expressibility and maintainability of the parallel computer program." Office Action, p. 5. Such improvement is merely the purported advantage of Sundaresan, and is not any valid motivation to combine Sundaresan and Poulsen.

2

Nowhere can the Office Action point to any disclosure in either of Poulsen or Sundaresan that teaches or suggests the desirability of modifying Poulsen such that its thread privatizable storage objects are somehow transformed into reduction operations. This is especially so, as Poulsen nowhere teaches the use or desirability of reduction operations. Instead, Poulsen is directed to transformation of a program such that multiple threads can access global storage objects in a privatized manner. Poulsen, col. 4, ln. 62-col. 5, ln. 6. Further, Sundaresan nowhere teaches or suggests that its parallel program be modified for use with such privatizable storage objects. Finally, the modification proposed by the Office Action would change the principle of operation of Poulsen, running afoul of the MPEP's proscription against such a modification. MPEP §2143.01.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 and claims 3, 6-7, 21 and 23 depending therefrom are patentable. For at least the same reasons, claims 8, 10-14 and 26 and claims 15, 18 and 20 are also patentable.

For at least the same reasons discussed above the rejection of claims 22, 24 and 25 under §103(a) over Poulsen in view of Sundaresan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,617 (Hardwick) is also overcome.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____February 10, 2006

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

3